REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, 10, 19 and 26 have been amended as indicated above. New claims 32-40 have been added. Thus, claims 1-16, 18-24 and 26-40 are pending in the application. The Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to issuance. No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendments to the claims.

Examiner Interview

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the time spent on November 13, 2006 discussing the disposition of this case by telephone with Applicant's representative. During the discussion, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the cited art and some claim modifications that would potentially receive favorable treatment by the Examiner. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiners comments and suggestions in this regard. While Applicant believes that such modifications are unnecessary, in the spirit of advancing prosecution of this matter, Applicant has made the clarifying amendments listed above and discussed below.

§ 101 Rejections

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to, in the view of the Office, non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office asserts that the "computer-readable medium" as recited by claim 9 includes intangible media such as a "modulated data signal, such as a carrier wave or other transport mechanism" (page 2 of Office action).

Claim 9 has been amended as indicated above to specifically recite "a tangible computer readable medium...". The Applicant believes that such amendment to claim 9 fully addresses the rejection under § 101 and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn. The Applicant further asserts that claim 9 is allowable.

§ 102 and § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-16, 18-24, 26-28 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0054138 ("Hennum").

Claims 3, 12 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hennum, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,240 ("Sullivan").

The claims have been amended in view of the telephonic interview cited above. The Applicant believes that the § 102 and § 103 rejections as cited above are moot in view of the amendments to the claims, as further elaborated below in regard to the cited references to Hennum and Sullivan.

Hennum

Hennum is directed to a web-based environment by which a user can obtain help and other documentation corresponding to one or more sample applications stored on a server (Abstract; Para. 17-33 of Hennum). More to the point, Hennum is directed to providing assistance and information regarding the syntax and exemplary use of various programming languages (e.g., WordBasic, Visual Basic, Java, etc.) by providing interactive programming examples to a user (Para. 54-55, etc., of Hennum).

However, Hennum expresses no interest or concern for a UI for remotely managing one or more of a disk, a volume, a user, a user group, or a directory of a first computer or device. Furthermore, Hennum neither teaches nor suggests determining and performing required modifications to the set of context sensitive information in accordance with compatibility criteria of the second computer.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant believes that the provisions and teachings of Hennum are substantially different than, and deficient with respect to, the subject matter of the pending claims.

Sullivan

Sullivan is directed to automated technical support of a user's client machine, wherein the user can elect to review self-help information provided by a server or to initiate a live help session with a support engineer (Abstract of Sullivan). During such a live help session, the support engineer is able to review the self-help session completed thus far, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user's client machine (Abstract of Sullivan). In particular, Sullivan is concerned with diagnosis and repair of a user's client computer (Col. 2, lines 20-34 of Sullivan).

However, Sullivan is not concerned with a UI for remotely managing one or more of a disk, a volume, a user, a user group, or a directory of a first computer or device. Furthermore, Hennum neither teaches nor suggests determining and performing required modifications to the set of context sensitive information in accordance with compatibility criteria of the second computer.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant believes that the provisions and teachings of Sullivan alone or in combination with any of the references of record

are substantially different than, and deficient with respect to, the subject matter of the pending claims.

Conclusion

The Applicant asserts that the pending claims 1-16, 18-24 and 26-40 are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/3/07

By: _____

Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256